APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,589	07/25/2003	Tsuneaki Kurumida	00862.023156.	9753

5514   7590   09/30/2010
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800

EXAMINER
RODRIGUEZ, LENNIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/30/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	10/626,589	KURUMIDA, TSUNEAKI
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	LENNIN RODRIGUEZ	2625	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 June 2010</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>33-38</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>33-38</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 6/29/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument regarding "Hanson's list of installed fonts, however, is not seen to correspond to the claimed list of code systems supported by a printer" have been fully considered; in response Yoshida '332 discloses an obtainment unit (Fig. 2, a program in the work station for obtaining information) configured to obtain a list of code systems supported by a printer (Fig. 4, 506 in Fig. 5 and column 11, lines 27-38, it can be easily seen that a list is being gathered).

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 6/29/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument regarding "Hanson's list of installed fonts is not displayed 'responsive to a determination that the code system of a designated font is not included in a list of code systems supported by a printer'" have been fully considered; in response Hanson does teach that the fonts list will be displayed after a determination that the printer does not support it (the determination being made by a user that is using the system and recognizes the lack of support).

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 6/29/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument regarding "none of Yoshida, Hanson or Oomura are seen to disclose or to suggest accepting of a selection of a code system from a displayed list of code systems, or assigning a code corresponding to the selected code system to the pattern of the designated font" have been fully considered; in response a

selection unit configured to select a code system from the list of code systems displayed by the display unit in accordance with a user selection (81b in Fig. 8D, where a selection window to select a font from a list of fonts is presented); and Oomura '063 teaches assigning a code corresponding to the code system selected by the selection unit to the pattern of the font designated by the designation unit. (Fig. 8 and paragraph [0269], lines 3-8, where the table contains the codes of Unicode and other codes from other code systems and the Unicode character codes are indeed assigned to a glyph corresponding to the character needed);.

4.   Objection to the specification has been withdrawn in view of the submitted amendment.

5.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is sustained. As seen in Simpson (US 6,981,033), column 6, lines 4-7, a transitory medium (signal) can be used as a storage medium, since the present invention can possibly be directed to this subject matter (signal or transitory medium) claim 38 is deem rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7.   Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A computer readable storage medium is recited, however, a computer readable storage medium can possibly be a transitory medium or a non-transitory medium. It is not clear as to which one of the two media

these claims are referring to; therefore there is a reasonable speculation as to this computer readable medium being a transitory medium (As seen in Simpson (US 6,981,033), column 6, lines 4-7, a transitory medium (signal) can be used as a storage medium). Examiner suggests amending claim 30 to "A **non-transitory** computer-readable storage medium…".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

9.   Claims 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al. (US 5,361,332) in view of Hanson (US 6,148,346) and Oomura et al. (US 2003/0002063).

(1) regarding claims 33, 37 and 38:

Yoshida '332 discloses an information processing apparatus (Fig. 2, work station), comprising:

an obtainment unit (Fig. 2, a program in the work station for obtaining information) configured to obtain a list of code systems supported by a printer (Fig. 4, 506 in Fig. 5 and column 11, lines 27-38, it can be easily seen that a list is being gathered);

a designation unit (Fig. 2, a program in the work station for specifying the font type) configured to designate a font to be downloaded (column 2, lines 35-42, where if

the determination of another device having font information is affirmative, a font to be downloaded is designated);

a determination unit (a program in the work station for making decisions in Fig. 2 and 1) configured to determine whether a code system of the font designated by the designation unit is or is not included in the list of code systems obtained by the obtainment unit (column 2, lines 35-42, where a determination as to whether or not the machines have the same font manager its being made);

a download unit (Fig. 2, a program in the work station for downloading information to the printer) configured to download a pattern of the font designated by the designation unit (column 13, lines 33-36, font data identified from other devices is loaded down to the printer).

Yoshida '332 discloses all the subject matter as described above except a display unit configured to display the list of code systems obtained by the obtainment unit responsive to a determination that the code system of the font designated by the designation unit is not included in the list of code systems obtained by the obtainment unit;

a selection unit configured to select a code system from the list of code systems displayed by the display unit in accordance with a user selection;

However, Hanson '346 teaches a display unit (15 in Fig. 2) configured to display the list of code systems obtained by the obtainment unit responsive to a determination that the code system of the font designated by the designation unit is not included in the list of code systems obtained by the obtainment unit (81b in Fig. 8D, where a selection

window to select a font from a list of fonts is presented and column 6, lines 30-45, where the fonts to be downloaded are supported by the current printer);

a selection unit configured to select a code system from the list of code systems displayed by the display unit in accordance with a user selection (81b in Fig. 8D, where a selection window to select a font from a list of fonts is presented);

Having a system of Yoshida '332 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Hanson '346 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the font downloading apparatus, method and computer-readable storage medium of Yoshida '332 to include a display unit configured to display the list of code systems obtained by the obtainment unit responsive to a determination that the code system of the font designated by the designation unit is not included in the list of code systems obtained by the obtainment unit; a selection unit configured to select a code system from the list of code systems displayed by the display unit in accordance with a user selection as taught by Hanson '346 because the user will have the option to make a selection of the font is best suites their needs through a display device, thus increasing usability and becoming user-friendlier.

Yoshida '332 and Hanson '346 disclose all the subject matter as described above except a download unit configured to assign a code corresponding to the code system selected by the selection unit to the pattern of the font designated by the designation unit.

However, Oomura '063 teaches a download unit configured to assign a code corresponding to the code system selected by the selection unit to the pattern of the font designated by the designation unit. (Fig. 8 and paragraph [0269], lines 3-8, where the table contains the codes of Unicode and other codes from other code systems and the Unicode character codes are indeed assigned to a glyph corresponding to the character needed);

Having a system of Yoshida '332 and Hanson '346 and then given the well-established teaching of Oomura '063 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the font downloading apparatus of Yoshida '332 and Hanson '346 to include a download unit configured to assign a code corresponding to the code system selected by the selection unit to the pattern of the font designated by the designation unit as taught by Oomura '063 because since Unicode cannot be used in the OS, the graphic engine looks up a glyph index table corresponding to the character font designated by Unicode and transfers, to the printer driver a glyph index corresponding to the designated character code (paragraph [0275]), with this the system performance is improved as well as increasing the modularity of the system.

(2) regarding claim 34:

Yoshida '332 further discloses wherein said first obtainment unit obtains the first code system from the printer (506 in Fig. 5 and column 11, lines 27-38).

(3) regarding claim 35:

Yoshida '332 further discloses a holding unit (memory 209 or 203 in Fig. 2) configured to hold a model name of the printer and code systems supported by the printer corresponded to the model name (Fig. 4, 506 in Fig. 5 and column 11, lines 27-38, it can be easily seen that a list is being gathered and the device name has been interpreted as the device model);

wherein the obtainment unit obtains a list of the code systems supported by the printer from the holding unit (Fig. 4, 506 in Fig. 5 and column 11, lines 27-38, it can be easily seen that a list is being gathered from the stored information).

(3) regarding claim 36:

Yoshida '332 and Hanson '346 disclose all the subject matter as described above except wherein the printer has a conversion table that contains character codes of Unicode corresponding to positions of character codes of respective code systems,

wherein the printer comprises a printing unit configured to convert character codes input from the information processing apparatus to a pattern of Unicode by using the conversion table, and further configured to print by using the pattern of Unicode.

However, Oomura '063 teaches wherein the printer has a conversion table that contains character codes of Unicode corresponding to positions of character codes of respective code systems (Fig. 8 and paragraph [0269], lines 3-8, where the table contains the codes of Unicode and other codes from other code systems and the Unicode character codes are indeed assigned to a glyph corresponding to the character needed),

wherein the printer comprises a printing unit configured to convert character codes input from the information processing apparatus to a pattern of Unicode by using the conversion table, and further configured to print by using the pattern of Unicode (Fig. 8 and paragraph [0269], lines 3-8, where the table contains the codes of Unicode and other codes from other code systems and the Unicode character codes are indeed assigned to a glyph corresponding to the character needed).

Having a system of Yoshida '332 and Hanson '346 and then given the well-established teaching of Oomura '063 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the font downloading apparatus of Yoshida '332 and Hanson '346 to include wherein the printer has a conversion table that contains character codes of Unicode corresponding to positions of character codes of respective code systems, wherein the printer comprises a printing unit configured to convert character codes input from the information processing apparatus to a pattern of Unicode by using the conversion table, and further configured to print by using the pattern of Unicode. as taught by Oomura '063 because since Unicode cannot be used in the OS, the graphic engine looks up a glyph index table corresponding to the character font designated by Unicode and transfers, to the printer driver a glyph index corresponding to the designated character code (paragraph [0275]), with this the system performance is improved as well as increasing the modularity of the system.

Conclusion

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.   Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.   See MPEP § 706.07(a).   Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.   In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.   In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **LENNIN RODRIGUEZ** whose telephone number is (571)270-1678.   The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thur 7:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-7653. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/LENNIN RODRIGUEZ/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Mark K Zimmerman/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625